



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

51  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/601,591	09/25/2000	Jerome Meric	11345.024001	8352
22511	7590	10/06/2004	EXAMINER	
OSHA & MAY L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET HOUSTON, TX 77010			MA, JOHNNY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/601,591	MERIC ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Johnny Ma	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2000.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because reference numbers "S206" and "S208", of Figure 14, should read "S204" and "S206" respectively. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 12-13, 16-18, 21, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wasilewski et al. (US 2002/0044658 A1).

As to claim 1, note the Wasilewski et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system. The claimed “means for manipulating data received by the receiver/decoder according to a manipulation protocol” is met by “DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625 for decrypt and descramble services” (Wasilewski et al. [0139]). The claimed manipulation protocol “which is configurable in dependence on the conditional access system” is met by “EMMs that modify an entitlement agent’s authorization information are made in response to modification information 403 provided by the entitlement agent or required by the network operator... The EA modification information 403 contained in the EMM goes, however, to EMM manager 407, which uses the information to modify the authorization information for the entitlement agent in DHCT 333” (Wasilewski et al. [0089]). The claimed “means for storing parameters associated with the manipulation protocol” is met by “...storage provides a place to store the entitlement agent’s public key, the authorization information for the services and service instances provided by the entitlement agent, and the MSKs provided by the entitlement agent” (Wasilewski et al. [0091]). The claimed “means for receiving a command instructing configuration of the manipulation protocol in dependence on the conditional access system” is met by EA modification information for modifying the authorization information for the entitlement agent in DHCT 333 (Wasilewski et al. [0089]). The claimed “means for retrieving a parameter from the storage means in

Art Unit: 2614

dependence on the command” is met by the EA modification information used for modifications including adding or canceling services provided by the entitlement authority and changing the conditions under which access to instances of a given service will be granted (Wasilewski et al. [0089]) wherein retrieval of such data is inherent to its modification. The claimed “means for outputting said parameter to the manipulation means for use in configuring the manipulation protocol, whereby the manipulation means is not required to receive all parameters necessary to configure the manipulation protocol in dependence on all of the conditional access systems” is met by “DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625” (Wasilewski et al. [0139]).

As to claim 2, the claimed “arranged to output said parameter to the manipulation means upon receipt of a command instructing output of said parameter” is met by DHCTSE referring to stored entitlement information to determine if DHCT has an entitlement to receive the instance of service which the ECM accompanies wherein the DHCTSE processes the ECM if authorized (Wasilewski et al. [0139]).

As to claim 3, the claimed “comprising means for receiving a command notifying the device of updating of the parameters stored in the storage means” is met by “[t]he task of EMM manager 407 is to respond to EMMs which add or remove entitlement agents and to EMMs which modify the authorizations for an entitlement agent” (Wasilewski et al. [0088]).

As to claim 6, the claimed “wherein the device is capable of receiving commands from a configuring application” is met by “[t]he task of EMM manager 407 is to respond to EMMs

which add or remove entitlement agents and to EMMs which modify the authorizations for an entitlement agent" (Wasilewski et al. [0088]).

As to claim 12, the claimed "arranged to receive requests from a plurality of client applications for a plurality of parameters" is met by "applications running on DHCT 333 which use the conditional access system and DHCTSE 627" (Wasilewski et al. [0137]) wherein DHCTSE 627 provides encryption, decryption, digest, and digital signature services for such applications executing on DHCT (Wasilewski et al. [0139]) with associated parameters.

As to claim 13, the claimed "said manipulation means arranged to operate under the control of the device to manipulate data" is met by using entitlement information to determine whether DHCT receiving the ECM has an entitlement of the instance of service and, if authorized, processing ECM data and providing the control word to a service decryptor module (Wasilewski et al. [00139]). The claimed "and said means for storing parameters associated with the manipulation protocol" is met by memory containing keys, entitlement information, and executable code (Wasilewski et al. [0192-0195]).

As to claim 16, note the Wasilewski et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system. The claimed "means for manipulating data received by the receiver/decoder according to a manipulation protocol" is met by "DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625 for decrypt and descramble services" (Wasilewski et al. [0139]). The claimed manipulation protocol "which is configurable in dependence on the conditional access system" is met by "EMMs that modify an entitlement

Art Unit: 2614

agent's authorization information are made in response to modification information 403 provided by the entitlement agent or required by the network operator... The EA modification information 403 contained in the EMM goes, however, to EMM manager 407, which uses the information to modify the authorization information for the entitlement agent in DHCT 333" (Wasilewski et al. [0089]). The claimed "means for storing parameters associated with the manipulation protocol" is met by "...storage provides a place to store the entitlement agent's public key, the authorization information for the services and service instances provided by the entitlement agent, and the MSKs provided by the entitlement agent" (Wasilewski et al. [0091]). The claimed "receiving a command instructing configuration of the manipulation protocol in dependence on the conditional access system" is met by EA modification information for modifying the authorization information for the entitlement agent in DHCT 333 (Wasilewski et al. [0089]). The claimed "retrieving a parameter from the storage means in dependence on the command" is met by the EA modification information used for modifications including adding or canceling services provided by the entitlement authority and changing the conditions under which access to instances of a given service will be granted (Wasilewski et al. [0089]) wherein retrieval of such data is inherent to its modification. The claimed "outputting said parameter to the manipulation means for use in configuring the manipulation protocol, whereby the manipulation means is not required to receive all parameters necessary to configure the manipulation protocol in dependence on all of the conditional access systems" is met by "DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes

Art Unit: 2614

the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625" (Wasilewski et al. [0139]).

As to claim 17, the claimed "wherein said parameter is output upon receipt of a command instructing output of said parameter" is met by DHCTSE referring to stored entitlement information to determine if DHCT has an entitlement to receive the instance of service which the ECM accompanies wherein the DHCTSE processes the ECM if authorized (Wasilewski et al. [0139]).

As to claim 18, the claimed "comprising the step of receiving a command notifying the device of updating of the parameters stored in the storage means" is met by "[t]he task of EMM manager 407 is to respond to EMMs which add or remove entitlement agents and to EMMs which modify the authorizations for an entitlement agent" (Wasilewski et al. [0088]).

As to claim 21, the claimed "wherein commands are received from a configuring application" is met by "[t]he task of EMM manager 407 is to respond to EMMs which add or remove entitlement agents and to EMMs which modify the authorizations for an entitlement agent" (Wasilewski et al. [0088]).

As to claim 27, the claimed "wherein requests are received from a plurality of client applications for a plurality of parameters" is met by "applications running on DHCT 333 which use the conditional access system and DHCTSE 627" (Wasilewski et al. [0137]) wherein DHCTSE 627 provides encryption, decryption, digest, and digital signature services for such applications executing on DHCT (Wasilewski et al. [0139]) with associated parameters.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-5, 7, 19-20, 22, 28-29, 33-36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski et al. (US 2002/0044658 A1) in further view of Newby et al. (US 5,796,829).

As to claim 4, the claimed “wherein said parameters include an identifier of the conditional access system currently being used by the receiver/decoder.” Note the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses a conditional access system with different types of conditional access messages wherein the headers contain an identifier for the conditional access system and an identifier for the type of security algorithm used with the message, including encryption of the message and authentication of its contents (Wasilewski et al. [0161-0165]) wherein “in interpreting ECMs, DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625 in a form that it may use to decrypt or descramble services” (Wasilewski et al. [00139]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference is silent as to the ECM processing method. Now note the Newby et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system wherein upon determining that the receiver is authorized, “...conditional access controller 32 provides appropriate cryptographic information 42 to the decryptor 31 to thereby

Art Unit: 2614

enable the decryptor 31 to decrypt the received encrypted information segments 23... cryptographic information 42 includes the session key K and cryptographic data for defining the algorithm A or B utilized in the conditional access process" (Newby 6:31-45) wherein a status signal enabling access and data identifying the conditional access process used is used to retrieve cryptographic information from memory (Newby 9:1-41). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wasilewski et al. decryption if authorized with the Newby et al. conditional access system ID for the purpose of allowing the decryptor to correctly decrypt information by using the correct conditional access system.

As to claim 5, please see rejection of claim 4.

As to claim 7, the claimed "wherein the device is capable of changing an identifier of the conditional access system currently being used by the receiver/decoder in response to a command from the configuring application." Note the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses a conditional access system with different types of conditional access messages wherein the headers contain an identifier for the conditional access system and an identifier for the type of security algorithm used with the message, including encryption of the message and authentication of its contents (Wasilewski et al. [0161-0165]) wherein "in interpreting ECMs, DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625 in a form that it may use to decrypt or descramble services" (Wasilewski et al. [00139]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference is silent as to the ECM processing method. Now note

the Newby et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system wherein upon determining that the receiver is authorized, "...conditional access controller 32 provides appropriate cryptographic information 42 to the decryptor 31 to thereby enable the decryptor 31 to decrypt the received encrypted information segments 23...cryptographic information 42 includes the session key K and cryptographic data for defining the algorithm A or B utilized in the conditional access process" (Newby 6:31-45) wherein a status signal enabling access and data identifying the conditional access process is used to retrieve cryptographic information from memory (Newby 9:1-41). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wasilewski et al. decryption if authorized with the Newby et al. conditional access system ID for the purpose of allowing the decryptor to correctly decrypt information by using the correct conditional access system. Also note that a change occurs when the system decrypts a new stream of data that is encrypted using a different conditional access system.

As to claim 19, the claimed "wherein said parameters include an identifier of the conditional access system currently being used by the receiver/decoder." Note the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses a conditional access system with different types of conditional access messages wherein the headers contain an identifier for the conditional access system and an identifier for the type of security algorithm used with the message, including encryption of the message and authentication of its contents (Wasilewski et al. [0161-0165]) wherein "in interpreting ECMs, DHCTSE 627 uses the entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to

Art Unit: 2614

service decryptor module 625 in a form that it may use to decrypt or descramble services” (Wasilewski et al. [00139]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference is silent as to the ECM processing method. Now note the Newby et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system wherein upon determining that the receiver is authorized, “...conditional access controller 32 provides appropriate cryptographic information 42 to the decryptor 31 to thereby enable the decryptor 31 to decrypt the received encrypted information segments 23...cryptographic information 42 includes the session key K and cryptographic data for defining the algorithm A or B utilized in the conditional access process” (Newby 6:31-45) wherein a status signal enabling access and data identifying the conditional access process used is used to retrieve cryptographic information from memory (Newby 9:1-41). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wasilewski et al. decryption if authorized with the Newby et al. conditional access system ID for the purpose of allowing the decryptor to correctly decrypt information by using the correct conditional access system.

As to claim 20, please see rejection of claim 19.

As to claim 22, the claimed “wherein an identifier of the conditional access system currently being used by the receiver/decoder is changed in response to a command from the configuring application.” Note the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses a conditional access system with different types of conditional access messages wherein the headers contain an identifier for the conditional access system and an identifier for the type of security algorithm used with the message, including encryption of the message and authentication of its contents (Wasilewski et al. [0161-0165]) wherein “in interpreting ECMs, DHCTSE 627 uses the

Art Unit: 2614

entitlement information to determine whether DHCT 333 receiving the ECM has an entitlement for the instance of the service which the ECM accompanies; if it does, DHCTSE 627 processes the ECM, and provides the control word to service decryptor module 625 in a form that it may use to decrypt or descramble services" (Wasilewski et al. [00139]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference is silent as to the ECM processing method. Now note the Newby et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system wherein upon determining that the receiver is authorized, "...conditional access controller 32 provides appropriate cryptographic information 42 to the decryptor 31 to thereby enable the decryptor 31 to decrypt the received encrypted information segments 23...cryptographic information 42 includes the session key K and cryptographic data for defining the algorithm A or B utilized in the conditional access process" (Newby 6:31-45) wherein a status signal enabling access and data identifying the conditional access process is used to retrieve cryptographic information from memory (Newby 9:1-41). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wasilewski et al. decryption if authorized with the Newby et al. conditional access system ID for the purpose of allowing the decryptor to correctly decrypt information by using the correct conditional access system. Also note that a change occurs when the system decrypts a new stream of data that is encrypted using a different conditional access system..

As to claim 28, note the Wasilewski et al. reference that discloses a conditional access system. The claimed "receiver/decoder including means for storing parameters associated with manipulating data received by the receiver/decoder" is met by "EA modification information 403 contained in the EMM goes, however, to EMM manager 407, which uses the information to

modify the authorization information for the entitlement agent in DHCT 333... modifications include adding or canceling services provided by the entitlement authority and changing the conditions under which access to instances of a given service will be granted" (Wasilewski et al. [0089]) wherein "storage provides a place to store the entitlement agent's public key, the authorization information for the services and service instances provided by the entitlement agent, and the MSKs provided by the entitlement agent" (Wasilewski et al. [0091]). The claimed "and at least one application or further device" is met by executable code for performing processes necessary for the receiver/decoder to view conditional access information, wherein code is contained in memory (Wasilewski et al. [0191-0196]). Note, the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses conditional access messages including an identifier for the conditional access system and an identifier for the type of security algorithm used with the message (Wasilewski et al. [0160-0168]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference is silent as to the generation and outputting of an identifier. Now note, the Newby et al. reference that also discloses a conditional access system. The claimed "means for outputting said identifier to said at least one application or further device" is met by "[i]n the conditional access controller of Fig. 4, the status signal 84 includes both an enable signal and data identifying either condition access process A or conditional access process B as the conditional access process used for encrypting the information segment identified in the service request signal 40" wherein the corresponding cryptographic data is retrieved from memory (Newby 9:1-41) wherein it is inherent that an identifier be generated for the at least one parameter for successful retrieval. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wasilewski et al. conditional access system with plural

conditional access systems and security algorithms with the Newby et al. identifiers for the purpose of providing a means for processing received data signals using difference conditional access systems efficiently.

As to claim 29, the claimed “receiver/decoder being operable with different condition access systems” is met by conditional access messages including an identifier for the conditional access system and an identifier for the type of security algorithm used with the message (Wasilewski et al. [0160-0168]). The claimed “said parameters being associated with manipulating data received by the receiver/decoder according to a manipulation protocol which is configurable in dependence on the conditional access system” is met by the retrieval of parameters corresponding to a conditional access system used in the received stream as discussed in the rejection of claim 28.

As to claim 33, the claimed “arranged to store a plurality of parameters, each having a respective assigned identifier” is met by that discussed in the rejection of claim 28.

As to claim 34, the claimed “said means for storing parameters associated with the manipulation of data received by the receiver/decoder, and said further device or said application” is met by the storage of manipulation parameters as discussed in the rejection of claim 28.

As to claims 35-36, please see rejections of claims 28-29.

As to claim 40, please see rejection of claim 33.

6. Claims 8-11, 14-15, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski et al. (US 2002/0044658 A1) in further view of Brooks et al. (US 5,973,684).

As to claim 8, the claimed “wherein each said parameter comprises at least one byte of a section of a data packet to be received by the receiver/decoder” Note the Wasilewski et al reference discloses a receiver with a plurality of conditional access systems. Also note, the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses receiving a MPEG-2 transport stream (Wasilewski et al. [0131]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference does not specifically disclose the manner in which the transport stream is processed. Now note the Brooks et al. reference that discloses a digital entertainment terminal providing dynamic execution in video dial tone networks wherein the digital entertainment terminal receives and processes MPEG-2 encoded information (Brooks 5:54-6:34). The Brooks et al. reference further discloses “[w]ithin a transport stream, a program association table (packet PID 0) maps each program source with the PID value associated with a program map table (PMT) related to that source...The program map, in turn, specifies the PID values for packets containing video, audio and/or data from the particular source” (Brooks 6:61-7:8) wherein PID values may represent video, audio, closed captioning, data, conditional access data (Brooks 6:44-60; 7:9-17). “Once the DET identifies and captures the program map table, the program decoder can extract the video elementary stream, the audio elementary stream(s) and any associated data stream for decoding of the programming” (Brooks 7:18-25). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Wasilewski et al. conditional access system with MPEG-2 transport streams with the Brooks identifiers of various data for the purpose of capturing and decoding particular programs within a MPEG-2 transport stream.

As to claims 9-11, please see rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 14, the claimed "wherein said manipulation means comprises a demultiplexer and filter operable to filter specific components of data from the data received by the receiving means." Note the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses a MPEG-2 transport stream and demultiplexer (Wasilewski et al. [0062, 0131]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference does not specifically disclose how the MPEG-2 transport stream is processed. Now note the Brooks et al. reference that discloses a digital entertainment terminal providing dynamic execution in video dial tone networks. The Brooks et al. reference discloses decryptor module decrypting the packets identified by appropriate PIDs [filtered], as directed by microprocessor, in the data stream, when authorized (Brooks 19:44-20:51). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Wasilewski et al. conditional access system with MPEG-2 transport streams with the Brooks et al. decrypting of appropriate PID packets for the purpose of providing a means for decrypting and displaying particular programs within the transport stream.

As to claim 15, the claimed "wherein the manipulation protocol changes the filter so that only specific components of the data received by the receiving means are downloaded by the receiver/decoder" is met by the combination of claim 14, wherein DHCTSE controls access to transmitted programming wherein a selection of a different program would require modifying the filter to detect a new set of PIDs corresponding to the newly selected program.

As to claim 23, the claimed "wherein each said parameter comprises at least one byte of a section of a data packet to be received by the receiver/decoder" Note the Wasilewski et al reference discloses a receiver with a plurality of conditional access systems. Also note, the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses receiving a MPEG-2 transport stream (Wasilewski et al. [0131]).

Art Unit: 2614

However, the Wasilewski et al. reference does not specifically disclose the manner in which the transport stream is processed. Now note the Brooks et al. reference that discloses a digital entertainment terminal providing dynamic execution in video dial tone networks wherein the digital entertainment terminal receives and processes MPEG-2 encoded information (Brooks 5:54-6:34). The Brooks et al. reference further discloses “[w]ithin a transport stream, a program association table (packet PID 0) maps each program source with the PID value associated with a program map table (PMT) related to that source...The program map, in turn, specifies the PID values for packets containing video, audio and/or data from the particular source” (Brooks 6:61-7:8) wherein PID values may represent video, audio, closed captioning, data, conditional access data (Brooks 6:44-60; 7:9-17). “Once the DET identifies and captures the program map table, the program decoder can extract the video elementary stream, the audio elementary stream(s) and any associated data stream for decoding of the programming” (Brooks 7:18-25). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Wasilewski et al. conditional access system with MPEG-2 transport streams with the Brooks identifiers of various data for the purpose of capturing and decoding particular programs within a MPEG-2 transport stream.

As to claims 24-26, please see rejection of claim 23.

7. Claims 30-32 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wasilewski et al. (US 2002/0044658 A1) in further view of Newby et al. (US 5,796,829) and Brooks et al. (US 5,973,684).

As to claim 30, the claimed “wherein said at least one parameter comprises an identifier of a data packet to be received by the receiver/decoder.” Note the Wasilewski et al and Newby

Art Unit: 2614

et al. combination discloses a receiver with a plurality of conditional access systems with identifiers. Also note, the Wasilewski et al. reference discloses receiving a MPEG-2 transport stream (Wasilewski et al. [0131]). However, the Wasilewski et al. reference does not specifically disclose the manner in which the transport stream is processed. Now note the Brooks et al. reference that discloses a digital entertainment terminal providing dynamic execution in video dial tone networks wherein the digital entertainment terminal receives and processes MPEG-2 encoded information (Brooks 5:54-6:34). The Brooks et al. reference further discloses “[w]ithin a transport stream, a program association table (packet PID 0) maps each program source with the PID value associated with a program map table (PMT) related to that source...The program map, in turn, specifies the PID values for packets containing video, audio and/or data from the particular source” (Brooks 6:61-7:8) wherein PID values may represent video, audio, closed captioning, data, conditional access data (Brooks 6:44-60; 7:9-17). “Once the DET identifies and captures the program map table, the program decoder can extract the video elementary stream, the audio elementary stream(s) and any associated data stream for decoding of the programming” (Brooks 7:18-25). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Wasilewski et al. and Newby et al. combination with the Brooks identifiers of various data for the purpose of capturing and decoding particular programs within a MPEG-2 transport stream.

As to claim 31, please see rejection of claim 30.

As to claim 32, please see rejection of claim 30.

As to claims 37-39, please see rejection of claims 30-32.

***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Bayassi et al. reference (US 2004/0068541 A1) discloses broadcast and reception, and conditional access system therefor.

The Kostreski et al. reference (US 5,635,979) discloses a dynamically programmable digital entertainment terminal using downloaded software to control broadband data operations.

The Tamer et al. reference (US 6,671,881 B1) discloses a conditional access filter as for a packet video signal inverse transport system.

The Sullivan et al. reference (US 6,069,647) discloses a conditional access and content security method.

The Lett reference (US 5,771,064) discloses a home communications terminal having an applications module.

The Campinos et al. reference (US 6,035,038) discloses a conditional access system and smartcard allowing such access.

The Campinos et al. reference (US 6,091,818) discloses a conditional access system using messages with multiple encryption keys.

The Chaney reference (US 6,035,037) discloses a system for processing a video signal via series-connected high speed signal processing smart cards.

The Chilton, P. reference ("Software Implementation Issues in Digital Integrated Receiver Decoders," International Broadcasting Convention, 12-16 September 1996 (Conference Publication No. 428), pages 304-309) discloses a Universal Integrated Receiver Decoder capable

Art Unit: 2614

of receiving and displaying signals from a variety of delivery systems and broadcasters with difference conditional access systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnny Ma whose telephone number is (703) 305-8099. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jm



JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600